

## REMARKS

The specification has been reviewed, and a clerical error of the specification has been amended.

In the Office Action, claims 1 and 4 were objected to. Claims 1-2, and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Orime et al. (JP 2002-183365). Claims 3 and 5-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orime in view of Bickmore et al. Hasebe, and Makita.

In response to the Office Action, claims 2 and 4 have been canceled, and claim 1 has been amended to incorporate canceled claims 2 and 4 to further clarify the feature of the present invention. Claims 3, 6 and 8 have been slightly amended. Claims 5 and 7 have been amended to further clarify the feature of the invention. Claim 9 has been newly added.

In the Office Action, it is indicated that Orime discloses a service server as WWW server (paragraph 21, Fig. 9), and terminal devices owned by said informing person and said informed persons connected to each other via a computer network as an information network connecting two parties (paragraph 21, Fig. 9), and it is also indicated that Orime discloses said server transmits informing E-mails each including a URL as prospective clients receiving e-mail with URL (paragraph 31).

Orime is designed to enable the informing person to confirm the number of informed persons to attend by sending E-mail to the informing persons. Orime further enables the informing persons to help them decide whether the meeting is held or not based on the number of attendee, and make a reservation for a place to meet without contacting their clients later again. Orime, unlike the present invention, does not disclose the feature to detect the informed persons having not accessed.

On the other hand, claim 1 in the present invention discloses a structure where the informing person can confirm a status for

attendance of informed persons. Specifically, claim 1 discloses a structure wherein said service server comprises means for detecting data concerning said response column transmitted by each of the terminal devices owned by said informed persons, and means for transmitting a result of detection as a reporting E-mail to the terminal device owned by said informing person.

Orime does not expressly or inherently anticipate the means for detecting data and means for transmitting a result of detection in claim 1. Therefore, Orime does not anticipate every element in claim 1, and claim 1 is not anticipated by Orime.

Bickmore et al. was cited to show a re-authoring system for screen partition for various display capacities of terminal devices. However, Bickmore et al. does not disclose the server having the means for detecting data and means for transmitting a result of detection in claim 1.

Hasebe was cited to show a Web browser which displays information and gives a plurality of choices which at a minimum include deciding whether or not to resend the email.

Hasebe, however, discloses only a feature to resend email to the informed persons having not accessed URL attached in the E-mail. On the other hand, claim 5 in the present invention discloses a plurality of choices for re-sending methods including placing calls to first and second numbers of informed persons having not responded.

Makita was cited to show a system that sends an email linking a website that contains the results of user's answers similar to the results received for the invention of Orime (paragraph 31). In paragraph 31 of Makita, when a search completion is received from an automatic calculate-processing section 24, a search completion letter is e-mailed, so that precipitants can see the result through the internet. However, Makita does not disclose the server having

the means for detecting data and means for transmitting a result of detection in claim 1.


In claim 9, the informing system further comprises means for preparing a list of informed persons not having checked a transmitted message, and means for periodically reporting the list to the informing person. The features of claim 9 are not disclosed or suggested in the cited references, as well.

As explained above, the features now clearly defined in claim 1 are not disclosed or suggested in the cited references. Even if the cited references are combined, claim 1 and its dependent claims are not obvious from the cited references.

Reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

One month extension of time is hereby requested. A credit card authorization form in the amount of \$60.00 is attached herewith for the one month extension of time.

Respectfully Submitted,

By   
Manabu Kanesaka  
Reg. No. 31,467  
Agent for Applicants

1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 310  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
(703) 519-9785